

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/507,242

Applicant(s)

HANES ET AL.

Examiner

Padmavathi v Baskar

Art Unit

1645

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Padmavathi v Baskar.

(3)_____.

(2) Thomas Kowalski.

(4)_____.

Date of Interview: 10/28/02 .

Type: a)☒ Telephonic b)☐ Video Conference
c)☐ Personal [copy given to: 1)☐ applicant 2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes e)☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____ .

Claim(s) discussed: 8-19 .

Identification of prior art discussed: _____ .

Agreement with respect to the claims f)☒ was reached. g)☐ was not reached. h)☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: *Applicant's representative agreed to the amendments to the claims as set forth in the attached examiner's amendment, and have accordingly been found to be condition for allowance.* .

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i)☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/507,242

Applicant(s)

HANES ET AL.

Examiner

Padmavathi Baskar

Art Unit

1645

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) George C. Elliott, PH.D., Practice Specialist.

(3) _____.

(2) Thomas J. Kowalski, Esq.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 06 September 2002.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1,5,6 and 23-39.

Identification of prior art discussed: Genbank Accession Nos. Y13120 and AA182274.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Link Condition



George C. Elliott, Ph.D.
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1600

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Kowalski was informed that claims 1, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29 and 34 are allowable as written. Mr. Kowalski and Mr. Elliott discussed possible amendments to claims 5, 6, 27, 30 and 31 that should distinguish them over the prior art and put them into condition for allowance. Mr. Elliott suggested to Mr. Kowalski that cancellation of the remaining claims without prejudice to prosecuting them in a continuing application, would advance the prosecution of the current application towards allowance upon receipt of the discussed amendments.. (Page 12)